



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

NOV 09 2009

OFFICE OF  
ENFORCEMENT AND  
COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

Docket Management Facility, M-30  
U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building  
Ground Floor, Room W12-140  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20590

**RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards, Passenger Cars and Light Trucks, Model Years 2012-2016, Docket Number NHTSA-2009-0059**

To Whom It May Concern,

In accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards. In this DEIS, NHTSA considers the potential environmental impacts of new fuel economy standards that NHTSA is proposing pursuant to the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 for model year 2012-2016 passenger cars and light trucks.

For the purposes of the DEIS, NHTSA has presented a very detailed analysis of the potential impacts of its proposed action to energy resources, air quality, and climate change. The DEIS further describes the potential impacts of its proposed action to water resources, biological resources, land use and land development, safety, hazardous materials and regulated wastes, noise, socioeconomics, and environmental justice. EPA believes the DEIS adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts and cumulative effects of the proposed standards. EPA is supportive of the effort to raise fuel economy standards as part of the joint EPA/NHTSA National Program and believes that NHTSA's proposed action will result in environmental benefits.

We do have one area of clarification regarding the "rebound effect" which we suggest for inclusion in the Final EIS. While Appendix C recommends a rebound effect of 10 to 20 percent, and other sections of the DEIS recommend using an effect of 5 to 15 percent, a rebound effect of 10 percent was utilized in the analysis. EPA recommends that the FEIS include a paragraph

providing a clarifying synopsis of the methodology and values of the rebound effect used in the analysis.

Overall, EPA rates the document LO (Lack of Objections), which indicates that EPA has no significant concerns regarding the effects of the proposed action. A summary of EPA's rating criteria is enclosed.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and provide comment on the DEIS and will continue to provide assistance to NHTSA, pursuant to our status as a cooperating agency on the proposal, as the environmental review process moves forward. If you have any questions, please contact Robert Hargrove at 202-564-7157 or James G. Gavin at 202-564-7161.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Susan E. Bromm" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Susan E. Bromm  
Director  
Office of Federal Activities

Enclosure :

EPA's Summary of NEPA Rating Definitions



## SUMMARY OF RATING DEFINITIONS AND FOLLOW UP ACTION\*

### Environmental Impact of the Action

#### LO-Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

#### EC-Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impacts. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

#### EO-Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

#### EU-Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS state, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

### Adequacy of the Impact Statement

#### Category 1-Adequate

The EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collecting is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

#### Category 2-Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for the EPA to fully assess the environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

#### Category 3-Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

\*From EPA Manual 1640 Policy and Procedures for the Review of the Federal Actions Impacting the Environment